

REMARKS

This response is in reply to the Office Action rejection dated February 9, 2006. Claims 1-44 were pending in the application with claims 19-35 being withdrawn from consideration, and claims 1-18 and 36-44 being rejected.

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12-14, 17, 18, and 36 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0061215 (hereinafter Kamei). Kamei discloses an image forming device having input area for introducing media sheets to a main media path. The media sheets are moved past a transfer area where images are formed on a first side. The media path further includes a duplex path for moving the media sheets back through the transfer area for image formation on a second side. Kamei does not disclose the reasoning for introducing gaps between the various media sheets that are moved along the main and duplex media paths.

The present application is directed to an image forming device that moves media sheets along a media path and a duplex media path. Gaps are formed between the media sheets due to one or both of a single motor that controls the exit rollers and the fuser, and a power supply which is formed by two of the image forming units. Claims 1 and 17 have been amended to now more specifically state that some of the gap are formed based on the timing of the fuser and the exit roller that share a common motor. Kamei does not disclose a shared motor configuration that causes variation in the gaps. Therefore, independent claims 1 and 17, and dependent claims 2-16, and 18 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 15, 16, and 37-44 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Kamei in view of U.S. Patent 6,836,641. Claims 15 and 16 depend from independent claim 1 and are now patentable in view of the amendments and remarks made above. Claim 37 has been amended to now include the size of at least some of the gaps are determined based on the timing necessary to adjust voltages between two of the plurality of image forming units that share a power supply. Neither of these two references discloses adjusting the gaps because of a shared power supply. Claim 41 has been amended to now include that the processor further adjusts the gaps between the first and second media sheets. The adjustment is due to at least the motor that is

shared between the fuser and the exit roller, and the power supply that is shared between two of the image forming units. Again, neither of these references disclose varying the gaps because of these aspects. Therefore, independent claims 37 and 41 and dependent claims 38-40, and 42-44 are in condition for allowance.

The rejection of dependent claims 8 and 11 under 35 USC 103(a) is moot in view of the above amendments and remarks regarding independent claim 1.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, due to an indefinite recitation of a claim element. Claim 12 has been amended to correct this deficiency.

Claim 36 has been cancelled without prejudice.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicants submit that the application finds over the cited prior art and is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any issues remain unresolved, the undersigning attorney requests a telephone interview to expedite allowance and issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

COATS & BENNETT, P.L.L.C.



David D. Kalish
Registration No.: 42,706

Dated: April 26, 2006

P.O. Box 5
Raleigh, NC 27602
Telephone: (919) 854-1844
Facsimile: (919) 854-2084